

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-15 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification and claims 1, 3, 7 and 15 are amended and claim 2 is canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited therein. No new matter is added. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 15 can be found at, for example, page 8, lines 9-21. Claim 3 is amended to change its dependency from a canceled claim. Support for the amendment to claim 7 can be found at, for example, page 13, lines 14-27. Support for the amendment to the specification can be found at, for example, page 5, line 18 to page 8, line 2. Support for the amendment to the abstract can be found at, for example, page 5, line 18 to page 6, line 1. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representatives by Examiner Durham in the July 29 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks. Specifically, claims 1 and 15 are amended to comply with the Examiner's helpful suggestions made during the interview.

The Office Action objects to claims 1, 7 and 15 based on informalities. Claim 1 is objected to based on missing language. Claim 7 is objected to based on incorrect dependency. Claims 1 and 15 are objected to based on confusing language. As agreed during the personal interview, claims 1, 7 and 15 have been amended responsive to the Examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. As agreed during the personal interview, claims 1 and 15 have been amended responsive to the Examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

The Office Action rejects claims 2-14 based on their dependency on claim 1 and therefore are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. However, it is unnecessary to separately discuss the features recited in dependent claims 2-14 given the existence of clear distinguishing features in independent claim 1.

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,906,168 to Ito et al. (hereinafter "Ito"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the personal interview, Ito does not disclose a "frame drive unit which has a mounting part ... wherein the sewing machine body or the ink-jet printer is detachably attached to the mounting part of the frame drive unit," as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 15. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that Ito discloses a sewing machine cover which serves as a right-left/front-rear embroidery-frame drive mechanism. The sewing machine cover of Ito only serves to drive the movement of the embroidery frame and increase the surface area of the sewing surface (col. 8, lines 20-31). Ito in no way teaches or suggests the "sewing machine body or the ink-jet printer is detachably attached to the mounting part" or associated features recited in claims 1 and 15. Thus, Ito does not disclose a " frame drive unit which has a mounting part ... wherein the sewing machine body or the ink-jet printer is detachably attached to the mounting part of the frame drive unit,," as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 15.

Additionally, as agreed during the personal interview, Ito does not disclose a "a predetermined sewing reference position of a sewing needle in attaching the sewing machine body to the frame drive unit corresponds with a predetermined print reference position of a print head of the printer in a case where the printer is attached to the frame drive unit," as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 15. Ito discloses a position detection device (64) which determines whether the drive mechanism is in a storage condition (col. 10, lines 28-31 and 57-60). Ito does not disclose a "a predetermined sewing reference position of a

sewing needle in attaching the sewing machine body to the frame drive unit corresponds with a predetermined print reference position of a print head of the printer in a case where the printer is attached to the frame drive unit," as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 15.

Accordingly, the applied reference does not disclose all of the features recited in claims 1 and 15. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

John A. Radi
Registration No. 59,345

JAO:MQW/hms

Attachment:
Substitute Abstract

Date: July 30, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--